***The One-Two Punch of Viable Social and Environmental Justice Revolutions***

This paper offers a simple but comprehensive format for planning and evaluating viable social and environmental justice revolutions (changing regimes from top down to bottom up).

In his book “[The Gandhian Iceberg](https://www.amazon.com/Gandhian-Iceberg-Nonviolence-Manifesto-Turning/dp/0692756361),” Chris Moore Backman Identifies the two keys to the Gandhian Revolution leading up to [Indian Independence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_independence_movement) from Britain in 1947: constructive programs for developing Indian Identity and non-violent resistance (to being marginalized). These then, according to Backman, became the cornerstones of the civil rights movement of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee and of Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

A premise of this paper is that these keys represent the only two of eight possible Non-violent and/or Violent power relationships between contesting parties that can result in viable change when the violence capabilities of underdog pro-change forces are outmatched by the violence capabilities of the status quo, and that the other six power relationships show what the underdog pro-change forces are up against.

Below are eight such real and/or hypothetical power relationships regarding the social justice concerns of Gandhi v. the British Colonialists, Jesus v. The Jewish high priest and Caesar, and Abraham v. God and the environmental justice concerns of Environmentalists v. Polluters. Upon reading these, judge for yourself whether the first, *N*>*N*, non-violent constructive programs of the underdog for change prevailing over non-violent constructive programs for non-change*,* and the third, *N*>*V,* non-violent resistance and civil disobedience of the underdog prevailing over pro no change violence against it are the keys to viable change and the other six more violent or more pro non-change measures are not.

*Native Indians v. British Colonialists for India’s Independence from Britain*

1. *N>N*: Natives and/or colonialists more aware of the non-violent benefits of native programs, below, than of the non-violence or benefits of government programs, if any, addressing similar needs. From The Gandhian Iceberg, p. 129:

* Heart unity across racial lines and political lines
* Sobriety
* Community-run schools
* Self-Sufficiency
* Uplift of women
* Health and hygiene education
* Economic equality
* Labor unions
* Local shops, industries and services
* Adult education
* Gift economics

2. N<N: Natives and/or Colonialists less aware of non-violent benefits of native programs than those of government programs, below, addressing the same needs

* Attendance at government-operated schools
* Employment at government friendly business, utilities, police forces, and administrations
* Obedience to beneficial government laws and courts

3. *N>V*: Native Non-violent Resistance -- natives and/or colonialists more aware of non-violent benefits of native programs, below, than of the violence of the government against them. From The Gandhian Iceberg, p182:

* Strikes, slow-downs, boycotts, sit-ins, protest marches, civil disobedience against unjust [“Jim Crow”-style] laws and fasting
* Active and Courageous
* Seeks reconciliation not victory over
* Distinguishes injustice from persons behaving unjustly
* Requires willingness to suffer without retaliation
* Rejects physical and spiritual violence (hate, ill-will humiliation, deceit, etc.)
* Is rooted in the conviction that the universe is on the side of justice and truth
* Long term ethical triumph more important than economic efficiency or short term gain

4. V<N Colonial Non-violent Resistance: Natives and/or colonialists less aware of violence of native programs than non-violent benefits of government programs, below

* Meeting native demands that help the government rule more peacefully
* Propaganda that intimidates or befriends would-be terrorists into non-violent behavior
* Government informants and plants that promote ethical behavior of unethical groups

5. N<V: Natives and/or colonialists less aware of the non-violent benefits of native programs than of the violence of government programs

Government crackdown or infiltration of native-oriented

* local businesses,
* farms,
* associations,
* schools,
* courts,
* demonstrations,
* boycotts, marches, fasting, etc.

6. V>N: Natives and/or colonialists more aware of violence of native programs, below, than of the non-violent benefits of government programs

* Rebel-led armed civil war, ala the French revolution
* Terrorist bombings (including suicide bombings), train derailments, assassinations
* Conspiracies
* Coups

7. V>V: Natives and/or colonialists more aware of violence of native programs than of violence of colonial programs. (Did not occur in India)

* Civil wars, such as the American Revolutionary War, in which those not in power are victorious
* Attempted terrorist bombings (including suicide bombings), train derailments, assassinations, etc. that are successful despite government police actions

8. V<V: Natives and/or colonialists less aware of violence of native programs than of violence of government programs

* Attempted terrorist bombings (including suicide bombings), train derailments, pipeline destructions, assassinations, etc. that are unsuccessful due to police actions by the government
* Civil wars, such as the American Civil War in which those in power are victorious. (civil war for independence did not occur in India)

*Environmentalists v. Polluters to Stop Global Warming and Pollution and Switch to 100% Renewable sources of Energy*

1. *N>N*: Public’s awareness of the non-violent benefits of the environmentalist’s program is greater than their awareness of the non-violent benefits of the polluter’s program through

* Nature-appreciation courses, events, service projects/awards
* Public awareness of global warming’s dire effects on droughts, famines, hurricanes, rising seas, disease epidemics, mass migrations, extinctions of species, etc.
* Consumer and Industry energy and resource conservation
* Green jobs recruiting and training campaigns
* Renewable energy research, development and implementation
* Renewable and low energy housing and transportation investments and incentives

2. N<N: Public’s awareness of the non-violent benefits of the environmentalist’s program is less than their awareness of the non-violent benefits of the polluter’s program

* Employment at fossil fuel friendly business, utilities, police forces, and administrations
* Public’s profits from investments in fossil fuel companies
* Availability of fossil fuels for cars, heating and generation of electricity
* Public doesn’t challenge the fossil fuels industry’ argument that the falling price of solar cells and wind turbines will cause the requisite switch to these technologies

3. *N>V*: Public’s awareness of the benefits of the environmentalist’s non-violent demands for ending the chaos of environmental pollution

* Church-supported efforts encouraging member participation in hurricane and immigrant relief efforts
* Town-hall-style grass roots opposition to destroyers of the “common air we breathe and the planet we live on.”.
* Environmental justice [“Green Peace”] actions, sit-ins, boycotts, fasts, trespass on fossil fuel operations and other occupy-Wall Street-like acts of civil disobedience
* Campaigns to have individuals and pensions funds divest themselves of fossil fuel stocks and bonds
* Public letter writing campaigns to newspaper editors and lobbying of members of congress decrying the harms of, and promoting solutions for, global warming
* Non-profit and constituent campaigns to ban fracking, clear cutting, mono-crop soil depletion, and species extinction
* Target dates and feedback and control systems for achieving consumption of 100% renewable energy
* Constituent moral and financial support of pro-environment members of Congress
* Mandated EPA authority to cap, reduce, price, tax and regulate GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050
  + Distribution of a proportion GHG-related revenues collected to households to
    - Pay for solar cells for their home or business
    - Pay for electricity produced from 100% renewable sources
    - Buy vehicles, washers and stoves powered by electricity produced from renewables, instead of fossil fuels
    - Contribute or volunteer with environmental non-profits
  + Government distribution of a proportion of GHG-related revenues collected to projects for low emission transportation and housing, public health mitigation, renewable energy generation and green jobs training.

4. V<N: Public’s awareness of the violence of the environmentalist’s program is less than their awareness of the non-violent benefits of the polluter’s program

* Promises of jobs and financial return by fossil producers and users is not out-matched by awareness of threats and actions of eco-terrorists

5. N<V: Public’s awareness of the non-violent benefits of the environmentalist’s program is less than their awareness of the violence of the polluter’s program

* Pro-environment members of Congress intimidated by the lobbyists and election campaign donations of the fossil fuel industry

6. V>N: Public’s awareness of the violence of the environmentalist’s program is greater than their awareness of the non-violent benefits of the polluter’s program

* Promises of jobs and financial return by fossil producers and users is outmatched by awareness of eco-terrorist threats and actions of bombings, train derailments, pipe line destruction, physical invasions of polluters’ privacy, etc.

7. V>V: Public’s awareness of the violence of the environmentalist’s program is greater than their awareness of the violence of the polluter’s program

* Dire pollution scenarios of environmentalists out-matches security-related energy independence arguments of Koch brothers (oil men)-supported politicians
* Eco-terrorist threats and actions of bombings, train derailments, pipe line destruction, physical invasions of polluters’ privacy, etc. are performed despite government police actions to prevent them

8. V<V: Public’s awareness of the violence of the environmentalist’s program is less than their awareness of the violence of the polluter’s program

* Dire pollution scenarios of environmentalists outmatched by security-related energy independence arguments of Koch brothers (oil men)-supported politicians
* Attempted eco-terrorist bombings, train derailments, pipe-line destruction, etc. prevented by government police actions
* Eco-terrorist s sentenced to long prison terms

*Jesus v. Caesar and Jewish high priest as Ruler of the Jews*

1. *N>N*: The Jews are more aware of the non-violent benefits of Jesus’s program than those of Caesar’s and the Jewish high priest’s program

* The Jews and Jesus wanted three things that the Romans and the Jewish high priest wouldn’t give them: Self-rule, worship of their own god, not Caesar, and relief from oppressive Roman taxes. In addition
* Jesus performed many miracles of healing
* Jesus voiced many anecdotal parables of the triumph of love and good works over hate and greed
* His ruling principles were to love God (your higher power or the community of all that is) with everything you have, love your neighbor as part of yourself and to bear witness to the truth of constructive behavior. ([Matthew 22:34-40](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=matthew+22%3A34-40&version=NIV), [John 18:37](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John+18%3A37&version=NIV))

2.N*<*N: The Jews are less aware of the non-violent benefits of Jesus’s program than those of Caesar’s and Jewish high priest’s program.

* Not true – see #1

*3. N>V*: Non-violent Resistance – The Jews are more aware of the non-violent benefits of Jesus’s program than of the violence of Caesar’s and the Jewish high priest’s program

* **38**“You have heard that it was said, ‘Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth.’[[c](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+5%3A30-50&version=NIV#fen-NIV-23273c)]**39**But I tell you, do not resist an evil person. If anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to them the other cheek also. **40**And if anyone wants to sue you and take your shirt, hand over your coat as well. **41**If anyone forces you to go one mile, go with them two miles.”  ---Jesus ([Matthew 5:38-41](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+5%3A38-41&version=NIV))
* In allowing himself to be executed, Jesus decides to do good works through his followers and their progeny in service to a God of peace and, thus not be intimidated by Caesar’s and the Jewish high priest’s god of violence for doing so. This principle was echoed in many statements by Gandhi
  + “The first principle of nonviolent action is that of non-cooperating with anything humiliating.”
  + “I cannot conceive a greater loss to a man than the loss of his self-respect.”
  + “I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honor than that she should, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonor.”
  + “To command respect is the first step to swaraj (self-rule).”

4. V<N: The Jews are less aware of the violence of Jesus’s program than of the non-violent benefits of Caesar’s and the Jewish high priest’ s program

* Not true. The Jews were not aware of Jesus being violent or of Caesar and the Jewish high priest providing them with benefits

5. V>N: The Jews are more aware of the violence of Jesus’s program than of the non-violent benefits of Caesar’s and the high priests’ program

* Not true. The Jews were not aware that Jesus was violent

6. N<V: The Jews are less aware of the non-violent benefits of Jesus’s program than of the violence of Caesar’s and the Jewish high priests’ program

* The Jews choose to save Barabbas instead of Jesus because they feel Jesus’s program of loving your enemy cannot stand up to Caesar’s and the Jewish high priest’s violence. ([Mark: 15:6-15](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Mark+15%3A6-15&version=NIV))

7. V>V: The Jews are more aware of the violence of Jesus’s program that could overwhelm that of Caesar’s and the Jewish high priests’ program

* Not true. The Jews were not aware that Jesus was violent. They were aware that the Romans were violent

8. V<V: The Jews are less aware of the violence of Jesus’s program than that of Caesar’s and the Jewish high priest’s program

* The Jews do not believe that the violence Jesus could muster against that of Caesar and the Jewish high priest would be sufficient to vanquish the.

*Abraham v. God in worshiping a God of peace instead of a God of violence* *(*[*Genesis 22:1-19*](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+22%3A1-19&version=NIV)*)*

1. *N>N*: Abraham has greater awareness of the non-violent benefits of his own plan for the future than of just God’s program

* Abraham decides to focus on doing good works and inspire his descendants to hear God’s voice instead of just waiting for blessings from God

2. N<N: Abraham has less awareness of the non-violent benefits of his own program than of God’s program

* Abraham ponders that the blessings from not sacrificing Isaac, who has no known skills, could possibly be less than from sacrificing Isaac, because Ishmael, his son by Hagar, is a better archer and warrior ([Genesis 16:20](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+16:12), [Genesis 21:20](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+21%3A20&version=KJV)).

*3. N>V*: Non-violent Disobedience – Abraham is more aware of the non-violent benefits of his own program than of the violence of God’s program

* Abraham decides to do good works through Isaac’s good works and progeny in service to a God of peace instead of being intimidated by a God of violence into harming Isaac

4. V<N: Abraham is less aware of the violence of his own program than of the non-violent benefits of God’s program

* Abraham considers showing deference to God’s command to violently offer Isaac, as God has promised him many descendants to magnify His glory if he does

5. V>N: Abraham is more aware of the violence of his program than of the non-violent benefits of God’s program

* Abraham ponders wheather greater benefits can be had from subjugating others than serving a God of peace

6. N<V: Abraham has less awareness of the non-violent benefits of his own program than of the violence of God’s program.

* Abraham starts to obey God’s command to sacrifice Isaac, possibly out of fear of reprisals from God that would be greater than any blessings he would have if he didn’t

7. V>V: Abraham is more aware of the violence of his own program than of the violence of God’s program.

* Abraham may have briefly considered that doing evil to others would be more beneficial than the possible harm from God for doing so

8. V<V: Abraham has less awareness of the violence of his own program than of the violence of God’s program

* Abraham considers risking Isaac’ s life by having him attack a neighboring tribe for property and slaves but then repents for fear that God may side with the other tribe

So, are constructive non-violent programs and non-violent resistance actions the one-two punch of social or environmental justice revolutions? If so, get into the fight!